

3502002 SPECIFICATION
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

.....
Ananth Prasad
(850) 942-1405
www.FTBA.com

Comments: (Internal 10-21-20)

This spec needs more discussion before it goes further ... See the strong concern received below:

“The joint between the concrete pavement and concrete curb & gutter is a huge issue on every concrete pavement job that has curb & gutter. Some Districts and CEI’s consider the payment of this quantity to be included in Pay Item 350-5, and some Districts and CEI’s consider it subsidiary to Pay Item 520 Curb and Gutter. What exactly is this language saying? That the C&G joint is included in 350-5? Or that the C&G joint is not going to be measured for payment?

I feel very strongly that there should be a 350-5 Pay Item for standard concrete pavement joints that are typically 3/8” max width, and an added Pay Item 350-__ for the C&G joint that is a totally different joint. The C&G joint is a 1/2”-3/4” joint that is placed in a joint with 1/4” radius edges and uses much more silicone (\$\$\$). With so many EOR’s not providing a detailed joint layout for projects, and therefore only a general estimate of joint quantities, it is unfair for contractors to have to figure what proportion of final joint quantity is which type.

Response:

Ananth Prasad
(850) 942-1405
www.FTBA.com

Comments: (Internal 10-23-20)

Another comment received:

While we agree that having a separate pay item for curb and gutter joint sealing would be helpful from a pre-bid take-off perspective, we understand FDOT isn’t going to make a pay item for every incidental item out there. The expansion and joint seal is shown in the curb and gutter design standard, and therefore we’ve considered it as part of the curb and gutter pay item in the past. That being said, we are a proponent for having a pay item for this item because it is much different than the between slab joints. It should certainly be clarified one way or the other.

A bigger issue we are currently experiencing is with joints adjacent to barrier walls. The question is whether an expansion joint with sealant is required or not, as it’s been different depending on who the CEI is and the district. Index 350-001, Sheet 3, Note 3 states “All manholes, meter boxes, and other projections into the pavement shall be boxed-in with a 1/2” preformed expansion joint material.” On all jobs so far except for one, FDOT has not required the expansion joint between concrete pavement and barrier walls, as they apparently didn’t consider the barrier wall to be a “projection into the pavement”, which we agree. This particular job considers barrier wall to be a “projection”, which we’ve submitted for additional payment and are being paid for, but still should be clarified one way or the other for future instances.

Response:

Deborah Ihsan
954-777-4387
deborah.ihsan@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (Industry 11-23-20)

Remove the wording from "Payment for the joints between concrete pavement and curb will be made under Section 520." and "new or" There is no separate payment for construction of new joints constructed with concrete pavement and curb per specs 520 and Standard Plans.) Therefore paragraph 1 the proposed revision may be modified to read as –
350-20.2 Joints and Cracks: For cleaning and sealing joints in new or existing concrete pavement, the quantity to be paid will be the length in feet, as determined by field measurement along the joints.

Response:
